

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Independent claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended to positively define the email attachment. The preamble of claim 7 has been amended to better comply with U.S. patent practice. New claims 8 and 9 have been added to further define independent claims 6 and 7, similar to claim 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Saito (USP 6,480,884) in view of Terek (USP 6,804,700). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Saito in view of Terek and Shiota (USP 6,683,700). Applicants submit that the present amendment renders moot these rejections at least to the extent that the claims now positively identify that the data file is an email attachment.

Applicants previously argued that Terek would not have disclosed or suggested generating a file name of an email attachment based on the subject header of an email. In this respect, applicants explained that Terek discloses naming an email attachment that is descriptive of its content, namely based on a “human-readable property,” rather than basing on the subject header of the email. Applicants also argued that Terek discloses setting the email attachment file name before generating an email, and that only the URL of the email itself is generated based on the subject header of the email or the preexisting file name of the email attachment.

In response, the examiner argued that the rejected claims do not require generating a filename of an email **attachment**. [Emphasis added]. Claims 1, 6, and 7 now explicitly recite that the data file is an email attachment. As none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught generating the name of an email attachment based on the subject header of an email, applicants submit that all of the pending claims define over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LYNE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)

10 APRIL 2006  
DATE